

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By the present remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that that the rejections of the November 27, 2007 Office Action have been overcome, and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Summary of the Official Office Action

The Office Action rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsueda (2002/0186400).

For the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is allowable over the cited art, and an indication of allowability of the present application is therefore respectfully requested.

Traversal of Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In re Claims 1-9

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 1-9 as being anticipated by Matsueda because each and every feature of the present invention is not disclosed in the reference.

As amended, independent Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, . . . "a determining unit configured to determine whether the print job specified in the request received by the receiving unit can be canceled; a responding unit configured to transmit response information indicating that the request for canceling the print job has been received to the information processing system **before cancellation of the**

print job specified in the request is completed in a case where the determining unit determines that the print job can be canceled and to transmit error response information to the information processing system in a case where the determining unit determines that the print job cannot be cancelled, **as a response to the request for canceling the print job** received by the receiving unit. . .”

Applicant respectfully submits that Matsueda fails to disclose at least the above-mentioned features of the present invention.

According to the invention defined in Claim 1, as a **response to a request** to cancel a print job, it is possible to inform a user that cancellation is completed in the case where the print job can be canceled. Furthermore, it is possible to inform the user that the cancellation of the print job cannot be performed in the case where a print job cannot be cancelled.

Reviewing Matsueda, it discloses that a server 202 specifies an ID of a job to be canceled and checks the status of the job corresponding to the specified ID when the server 202 acquires a job cancellation request from client 201 (figure 2, paragraphs 53-54). Additionally, when the checked status of the job is “being entered” (i.e. when the job is being transmitted from the client 201 to printer 231), the status of the job is set to “to be deleted” (figure 8, paragraph 82). Furthermore, when the checked status of the job is “already entered”, a job cancel command is issued to the printer 231, the cancel command response is received from the printer 231, and the status of the job is changed to “being deleted” (figure 7, paragraph 96).

The server 202 of Matsueda, however, is merely for informing the user that the job can be cancelled and does not determine whether or not the job specified in the job cancellation request can be canceled in the case where the job cancellation request is acquired.

Moreover, in Matsueda, since the server 202 of Matsueda does not determine whether or not the job can be canceled when the job cancellation request is acquired, it is impossible to transmit, before the cancellation of the job specified in the job cancellation request is completed, the response information indicating that the job cancellation request for canceling the job has been received in the case where it is determined that the job can be canceled. Also, it is impossible to transmit the error response information in the case where it is determined that the job cannot be canceled.

Because Matsueda lacks at least the above-noted features of the present invention, Applicant respectfully submits that Matsueda fails to disclose each and every feature recited in Claim 1, and that the office action has failed to establish an adequate evidentiary basis to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C § 102(b). Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection of at least independent Claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn and respectfully requests the Examiner indicate Claim 1 as allowable a the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Moreover, Independent Claim 6 is directed to a method for cancelling a print job, and was rejected for essentially the same reasons as Claim 1. As such, the arguments set forth above with respect to Claim 1 are applicable to Claim 6.

Claims 2-5 and 7-9 depend from at least allowable base Claims 1 or 6 and

are rejected for the same reasons. As such, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable at least for the reason that each of these claims depends from allowable base Claims 1 or 6 and recite additional features that further define the present invention. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the claims 2-5 and 7-9 as allowable at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Newly added Independent Claim 10 is seen to include at least the same limitations as allowable claim 1, and thus, Applicant believes Independent Claim 10 to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct or credit any underpayments or overpayments submitted in conjunction with this response from/to deposit account number **502456**.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the (949) 932-3329.

Respectfully submitted,

2/27/08
Date

/Sivon Kalminov/
Sivon Kalminov, Reg. No. 40,042
Attorney for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731
Fax: (949) 932-3560